

Claim 1, recites a combination of features for a method for analyzing a data network having a plurality of routers including:

accessing at least one of static routing information and route summarization information;  
determining an identity of a network prefix using the accessed information; and  
analyzing the data network using the determined identity.

Pelavin et al. is directed to using level three protocol information for network centric problem analysis and topology construction. In the Office Action, the Examiner cited item 5 of Figure 2-1 as disclosing static route information, and item 4 of Figure 2-1 as disclosing routing summarization information. The specification of Pelavin et al. describes item 5 as a Static Route and that the value of the Static Route is a list of objects, each of which is referred to as a static route. The specification further discloses that the static route is identified by specifying a destination address and a next router address. (Col. 13 lines 57-67). With regard to item 4, the corresponding text of Pelavin et al. discloses that this item is a protocol object that includes a "type" attribute and a "net addresses" attribute. The "type" attribute represents a type of routing protocol, and possibly also a number if multiple copies of the protocol are running on the router. The "net address" attribute lists the ports the associated protocol is running over. (Col. 13 lines 40-56). Pelavin et al., however, does not disclose the step of determining an identity of a network prefix using this information.

The Examiner alleged that Pelavin et al. discloses the step of determining an identity of a network prefix using the accessed information. In support, the Examiner

cited col. 9 lines 26-67 and Col. 10 lines 1-51 of Pelavin et al. In these sections, Pelavin et al. discloses a flow for the overall data and process flow of the alleged invention of Pelavin et al. This flow includes a number of sub-processes that include determining if there are problems in a network represented by an object model, integrity checks, calculating routing tables, etc. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions these sections do not disclose determining an identity of a network prefix using the accessed information. In fact, nowhere in this cited section are items 4 or 5 of Figure 2-1 even discussed. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Pelavin et al. does not disclose determining an identity for a network prefix using accessed information of at least one of static routing information and route summarization information.

If the Examiner believes Pelavin et al. discloses determining an identity of a network prefix using items 4 and 5 of Figure 2-1, in light of the extremely lengthy specification of Pelavin et al., Applicant respectfully requests that that the Examiner identify the column and line numbers of such disclosure.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Pelavin et al., for at least the reason that Pelavin et al. does not teach accessing at least one of static routing information and route summarization information, and determining an identity of a network prefix using the accessed information. Independent claims 7, 8, and 14 include similar recitations to that of claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 7, 8, and 14 are likewise allowable over Pelavin et al. for at least the above-discussed reasons with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that claims 2-6, 9-13, and 15-19 that depend on independent claims 1, 8, and

14 are likewise allowable at least due to their dependence on the corresponding independent claims.

The Examiner also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Pelavin et al.

Claim 20 recites:

A method for determining an identity of a network device, the network device being associated with network prefix, the method comprising:

accessing one or more of a border gateway protocol peering table, a static route table, an open shortest path first route summarization table, and a network topology table;

determining whether one of the accessed tables contains the network prefix; and

determining an identity of the network device when a table is determined to contain the network prefix.

In the Office Action the Examiner alleged that Pelavin et al. discloses accessing one or more of a border gateway protocol peering table, a static route table, an open shortest path first route summarization table, and a network topology table, and determining whether one of the accessed tables contains the network prefix. In support, the Examiner relied on items 4 and 5 of Figure 2-1 and the description of the general flow of Pelavin et al. as disclosing the accessing step.

As discussed above, item 4 is described in the specification of Pelavin et al. as a protocol object that includes a type attribute representing a type of protocol and a net addresses attribute that lists the ports the associated protocol is running over. And item 5 is described in the specification as a Static Route that is a list of objects.

With regard to the step of determining whether one of the accessed tables contains the network prefix, the Examiner relied on column 8 lines 62-67 and column 9

lines 1-38. This section, however, does not even mention item 4 or item 5 of Figure 2-1, let alone disclose determining an identity of a network prefix using them.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is allowable over Pelavin et al. for at least the reason that Pelavin et al. does not teach accessing one or more of a border gateway protocol peering table, a static route table, an open shortest path first route summarization table, and a network topology table, and determining whether one of the accessed tables contains the network prefix.

Applicant further respectfully submits that claims 22 and 24, which include similar recitations to that of claim 20, are likewise allowable over Pelavin et al. for at least the reasons discussed in regard to claim 20. Applicant further respectfully submits that claims 21, 23, and 25 that depend on independent claims 20, 22, and 24 are likewise allowable at least due to their dependence on claims 20, 22, and 24.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account No. 07-2339.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/4/2003

By: James K. Weixel  
James K. Weixel  
Reg. No. 44,399

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.  
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01  
Irving, TX 75038  
(781) 466-2220